

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-14, 28-41 and 55-68 are rejected by Examiner. Claims 1, 2, 14, 28, 29, 41, 55, 56, and 68 have been amended. Claims 15-27, 42-54 and 69-81 have been cancelled. Applicants thank the Examiner for her comments during a 4 December 2006 telephone interview.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-10, 12-14, 28-37, 39-41, 55-64 and 66-68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Zigmond et al (US 6,400,407) in view of Browne et al (WO 92/22983). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 28, and 55 have been amended to clarify the invention and appear as follows;

1. A process for frame specific tagging of television audio and video broadcast streams with tag translation at a receiver, comprising the steps of:  
tuning said receiver to a broadcast stream;  
receiving said broadcast stream at said receiver;  
storing said broadcast stream on a storage device on said receiver;  
detecting frame-specific tags inserted into said broadcast stream;  
processing said tags;  
displaying program material in said stored broadcast stream from said storage device to a viewer;  
wherein said processing step performs appropriate actions in response to said tags which include command and control information instructing said receiver to perform certain actions.

28. (Currently Amended) An apparatus for frame specific tagging of television audio and video broadcast streams with tag translation at a receiver, comprising:  
a storage device on said receiver;  
a module for tuning said receiver to a broadcast stream;  
a module for receiving said broadcast stream at said receiver;  
a module for storing said broadcast stream on said storage device;  
a module for detecting frame-specific tags inserted into said broadcast stream;  
a module for processing said tags;  
a module for displaying program material in said stored broadcast stream from said storage device to a viewer;

wherein said processing step performs appropriate actions in response to said tags which include command and control information instructing said receiver to perform certain actions.

55. (Currently Amended) A program storage medium readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for frame specific tagging of television audio and video broadcast streams with tag translation at a receiver, comprising the steps of:

- tuning said receiver to a broadcast stream;
- receiving said broadcast stream at said receiver;
- storing said broadcast stream on a storage device on said receiver;
- detecting frame-specific tags inserted into said broadcast stream;
- processing said tags;
- displaying program material in said stored broadcast stream from said storage device to a viewer;

wherein said processing step performs appropriate actions in response to said tags which include command and control information instructing said receiver to perform certain actions.

As discussed with the Examiner during the 4 December 2006 telephone interview, Zigmond does not teach or disclose a system that detects frame-specific tags inserted into said broadcast stream as claimed in Claims 1, 28, and 55. All Zigmond teaches is that a logical address such as a URL can be sent in line 21 of the VBI. Zigmond makes no mention of frame-specific tags and therefore does not contemplate such.

Therefore, Zigmond in view of Browne does not teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

Claims 1, 28, and 55 are allowable. Claims 2-10, 12-14, and 29-37, 39-41, and 56-64, 66-68 are dependent upon Claims 1, 28, and 55, respectively, and are allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 11, 38, and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Zigmond et al (US 6,400,407) in view of Browne et al (WO 92/22983) in further view of Dunn et al. (US 5,648,824). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding Claims 1, 28, and 55, above. Claims 11, 38, and 65 are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 28, and 55, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Entry of the amendments herein and further examination on the merits are respectfully requested.


The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 414-1080 ext. 214 to discuss any issue that may advance prosecution.

No fee is believed to be due specifically in connection with this Reply. To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be due in connection with this Reply to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: January 30, 2007

  
Kirk D. Wong  
Reg. No. 43,284

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1089  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 214  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on January 30, 2007  
(Date)

  
(Signature)